

Supra-national identification among movers and stayers in Europe

Pöttschke, Steffen; Braun, Michael

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Sammelwerksbeitrag / collection article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pöttschke, S., & Braun, M. (2014). Supra-national identification among movers and stayers in Europe. In E. Recchi (Ed.), *The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications among EU and Third-Country Citizens - Final Report* (pp. 84-113) <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395189>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications Among EU and Third-Country Citizens

Supra-national identification among
movers and stayers in Europe

Steffen Pöttschke and Michael Braun

(EUCROSS Final Report, pp. 84-113)

This document originates from the research project *The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens* (acronym: EUCROSS).

The EUCROSS research project is funded as part of the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme ('Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities', activity 8.5: 'The Citizen in the European Union'; call identifier: FP7-SSH-2010-2; Funding scheme: collaborative project – small and medium-scale focused research projects; grant agreement: 266767). The project started on April 1, 2011 and is scheduled to end on March 31, 2014.

The research consortium is formed by:

- Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara, Italy (coordinator: Ettore Recchi);
- GESIS–Leibniz Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Mannheim, Germany (coordinator: Michael Braun);
- Aarhus Universitet, Denmark (coordinator: Adrian Favell);
- IBEI–Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Spain (coordinator: Juan Díez Medrano);
- University of York, United Kingdom (coordinators: Mike Savage, Laurie Hanquinet);
- Universitatea din Bucuresti, Romania (coordinator: Dumitru Sandu).

EUCROSS scientific coordinator: Ettore Recchi. EUCROSS project manager: Matteo Abbate.

For additional information: www.eucross.eu.

This is Deliverable D9.17 of Workpackage 9 (Dissemination and exploitation). Release date: June 2014.

Supra-national identification among movers and stayers in Europe¹⁹

Introduction

The analysis of national and supra-national identification of native populations constitutes an important research agenda. This is not the least the case since the concerns and interests of citizens, or their disinterest in certain topics and concepts, are legitimate factors in the decision making of democratic entities. In this sense, questions of identification are relevant for the positioning of countries towards each other and, in particular, for their cooperation in the framework of supra-national entities, such as the European Union, or even on a global scale. Contrary to opinions often expressed by different national actors in public debates most studies have come to the conclusion that there is no incompatibility between national and European identifications but that they are complementary instead (Bruter 2005; Citrin and Sides 2004; Díez Medrano and Gutiérrez 2001; Duchesne and Frogner 2008; 2002).

As hypothesised in Deutsch's transactionalist theory, transnational relations of national populations, such as frequent foreign travel, knowledge of foreign languages and foreign friends have been demonstrated to increase identification with larger regional entities (Deutsch et al. 1957). However, transnational interactions are highly stratified across society and the younger and highly educated are much more frequently involved in these interactions than the elderly and the less educated (Kuhn 2011). As a consequence, the level of identification with Europe does not necessarily rise in tandem with an increase in these interactions. Instead, the stratification with regard to interactions could be reflected by stratification with regard to identification.

Using quantitative data gathered in 2012 and 2013 as part of the EUCROSS study, this chapter examines the identification with geographical entities (city, region, country, Europe, and the world) of nationals of Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom as well as Romanian and Turkish²⁰ migrants to these countries. However, the focus here is on the identification with Europe and cosmopolitan attitudes. By doing so we are investigating the conscious self-identification of individuals. On the contrary it is not our aim to inquire the existence of a "European identity". In drawing this distinction we follow Brubaker and Cooper (2000) who argue that "identity", due to its nature as a social construct, is not suitable as analytical category.

According to Mau and collaborators, transnationalism can be understood as involvement in cross-border interactions and mobility (Mau, Mewes, and Zimmermann 2008). Kuhn (2011) subdivides transnationalism into three dimensions: transnational background, transnational practices and transnational human capital. Transnational background includes migration experiences, transnational practices involves the interaction with non-national actors and sojourns abroad and transnational human capital includes foreign

¹⁹ Steffen Pötzschke and Michael Braun.

²⁰ Throughout the chapter we employ terms like 'Danes', 'Italians', 'Turkish (migrants)', 'Turks', 'Romanians' etc. to refer to individuals who are citizens of the respective countries. This means that we refer with these terms to nationality in a legal sense and not to ethnicity.

language proficiency and general education. It is particularly the first (transnational background) and also the third (transnational human capital) of these dimensions, in which migrants are different from the “stayer” part of a population.

The study of migrants introduces important additional aspects compared to the study of general populations. The mere fact of having migrated distinguishes the former already per definition from (internationally) immobile “stayer” populations. Their experiences should therefore be immediately conducive to transnational attitudes. Depending on the age at migration they have also been socialised in one or more countries and many of them are fluent in more than one language. In addition, migrants can relate not only to one country and to supra-national entities, but to two different countries in a much more encompassing sense than members of national populations with transnational contacts.

Studies of migration and integration have focussed mostly on the relationship of the migrants to both their country of origin (CoO) and country of residence (CoR) (Brubaker 1989). While many pioneering studies on “transnational social spaces” (Pries 2008) were conducted by researchers of this field, they usually did not take the migrants’ stance with regard to more encompassing entities, such as the European Union, into consideration. However, it should be noted that the majority of early transnationalism studies focused mainly on migration between the Americas (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton Blanc 1995; Guarnizo 1998; Smith 1998; Itzigsohn et al. 1999; Portes 1999) where entities comparable to the European Union with regard to its degree of institutionalisation, influence on national affairs and presence in the public space are currently not existent.

Migration research usually distinguishes four domains of migrants’ integration into a country of residence: cultural, structural, social and identificational (Esser 1980; Heckmann and Schnapper 2003). Cultural integration includes country of residence language proficiency, structural integration deals with citizenship rights, and the placement of migrants in the system of social stratification and social integration involves ethnic intermarriage and having friends from the country of residence. Finally, identificational integration consists in a strong feeling of belongingness or at least the acceptance of the values of a social system. Analyses in this tradition have focused on whether migrants have achieved (or are likely to achieve in the nearer future) full integration into their country of residence or whether they tend to segment, i.e. remaining primordially oriented to their country of origin or their co-nationals living in the country of residence. The main thrust of this chapter, however, will not be integration into the country of residence but European integration. Furthermore, it is confined to the aspect of identificational integration, and we will therefore not discuss the other domains. Even though we are not solely concentrating on migrant respondents the mentioned distinctions are very helpful since identification and integration processes of non-movers are influenced by the very same factors.

Regarding our migrant samples, we assume that the barriers to integration which Romanian movers have to face should be lower than those for Turkish citizens. This is not only due to the different formal rights accorded to both groups but also to (perceived) cultural, linguistic or historical ties between Romania and several countries of residence (namely Spain, Italy and Germany). Furthermore, the gap between intra-European migrants and those who originate from outside of the EU created in public discussion and

mass media seems to increase within the European Union as a whole. Alongside of only small remnants of the older guest worker migration and the following family reunification, intra-European migration constitutes to a high degree a “new” kind of migration, consisting of a novel mix of migrants coming for work or family reasons on the one hand and those coming to improve their education and quality of life on the other (Braun and Arsene 2009; Braun and Glöckner-Rist 2012). As Braun and Müller (2012) point out the awareness of integration deficits in many EU countries is largely confined to migrants from countries outside of the EU. Only for these groups language proficiency is made obligatory as an entry requirement in some EU countries. Furthermore, the political preference for migrants to assume the citizenship of the country of residence is also confined to these groups. A higher pressure to integrate might also lead to more discrimination, in particular because the opportunities to fully integrate are often not given. As McLaren (2001) found out, it is in particular the elites which differentiate between internal and external migrants in the EU and less the general population (though also the latter differ in their opinions depending on the migrant group).

However, it could also well be that the advantages common to EU-25²¹ citizens have not yet been generalised to Romanian nationals, for at least two reasons: First, Romania has become a member of the EU only very recently and Romanian workers had, at the time of the survey, not yet been granted free access to the labour market of all member countries. Hence, Romanian citizens of working age were excluded from one of the most important direct advantages of European unification.²² Second, since the time directly preceding the EU enlargement of 2004, there have been periodic and often populist discussions regarding feared mass migration of citizens from the new EU member states and presumed negative effects of their arrival on the labour market positioning of EU-15 nationals. These discussions were renewed before Romania and Bulgaria joined the European Union in 2007 and were intensified by the outbreak of the global financial crisis in the same year. In accordance with this, recent studies showed that Romanian migrants are routinely depicted negatively in the mass media of EU-15 countries (Light and Young 2009; Uccellini 2012). Finally, Romanians might often be confused with Roma (Moroşanu and Fox 2013). While, as argued above, in direct comparison with Turkish migrants Romanian movers should encounter less obstacles to integrate into CoR societies, these just mentioned additional aspects might cause the latter to face discrimination by the nationals of the different countries of residence, or at least produce a feeling of being discriminated.

Equally, It is to be expected that the respondents of the different national samples identify to varying degrees with Europe. However, differences in identification seem not to be directly related to the length of the membership period of a given member state. Fuchs (2011) found for instance that the attachment to Europe in some states which

²¹ In accordance with established conventions in studies of the European Union we apply the following definitions: ‘EU-15’ refers to all member states of the European Union before the enlargement of 2004, ‘EU-10’ refers to those EU member states which joined the Union in 2004, ‘EU-25’ refers to all member states of the European Union before the enlargement of 2007.

²² Restrictions regarding the access to the labour market were in place in four of the five surveyed countries of residence of Romanian migrants during the field period, the only exception being Denmark. See: European Commission 2011.

joined the EU in 2004 was above the EU-25 average (e.g., in the Czech Republic and Poland) while it was below average in others (e.g., in Cyprus and Lithuania). Based on a somewhat more elaborate indicator and focusing on political identity Scheuer and Schmitt (2007) also came to the conclusion that there is not necessarily a direct or linear relation between length of a country's EU membership and its population's identification with Europe. Hence, the stayer population in Romania could differ in either direction from the respondents in the other five member states.

The results of Braun and Müller (2012) on the basis of the PIONEUR (Recchi and Favell 2009) data on migrants from France, Germany, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom to the other four countries are most relevant for our purpose both as a sample of comparison and for generating hypotheses; therefore we will base several of our hypotheses on their main results. These intra-EU-15 migrants include a particularly large proportion of highly-skilled labour, study and "quality-of-life" migration, which are becoming increasingly important both quantitatively and qualitatively (King 2002). They are what Favell (2008) refers to as "free movers", who make highly individualised moves, independent of chain migration and not (primarily) motivated by economic or political reasons. The EU-15 migrants profit most from the dramatically increased freedom of movement across national borders which is facilitated both by the conferral of rights and advances in transportation (Recchi 2008). Indeed, these intra-European migrants can be considered a group to which European integration provides particularly large gains. Thus, it can be expected that their identification with the European Union is stronger in comparison to the native ("stayer") populations and this is what actually has been found to be the case. In contrast to EU-15 migrants, both migrant groups analysed here are, to different degrees, in disadvantaged positions. Regarding Romanians as "recent" EU citizens this means that they had – at the time of the survey – not yet been accorded all the same rights as the mobile individuals from longer established EU member states. Nevertheless, even with slightly limited membership rights, migrants from Romania were in a very privileged situation compared to those from Turkey.

Hypotheses

In this chapter, we are pursuing a set of related research questions. The first two refer to the comparison of stayers and movers:

- (1) Do migrants show indeed stronger supra-national identifications than stayers?
- (2) Do the variables measuring transnational background and behaviour work in a similar way for movers and stayers? Or is migration experience so dominant that additional transnational background and behaviour has a much lower importance for migrants?

The second set of main research questions relates to the difference between Romanian and Turkish migrant groups:

- (3) Do Romanian migrants indeed show a much higher identificational integration than Turkish migrants?
- (4) Is this difference related to the EU citizen rights accorded to the different groups?
- (5) Do the variables measuring transnational background and behaviour work in a similar way for both migrant groups?

Finally, we are interested in any differences in the level and the determination of identifications by transnational background and behaviour of the stayer populations.

From the literature on European identification among stayers (Citrin and Sides 2004; Dubé and Magni-Berton 2009), one can conclude that higher *educational qualifications* should lead to a stronger identification with the European Union. Braun and Müller (2012) also found strong educational effects for intra-EU migrants, in particular for having a university degree.

We postulate that the worse the *subjective economic situation* was at the age of 14, the stronger should European identification be at the time of the interview. The subjective economic situation at the age of 14 is likely to serve as a comparison standard against which the current situation is evaluated. With respect to national populations Fligstein (2009b) shows that the subjective economic situation at the time of the interview, however, has a positive effect on the identification with Europe. We expect to find the same effect both for stayers and movers.

When looking at the literature the effect of *gender* is not really clear. Among researchers who have used Eurobarometer data (from different waves) there seems to be consensus that, among stayers, women have a lower identification with the European Union than men (Citrin and Sides 2004; Fligstein 2009b; Risse 2010). With respect to research relying on other data, the results are not that homogenous. There are both examples which observe the same trend as the aforementioned research (Schmidt, Tenscher, and Weber 2003) and such which, on the contrary, find a more pro-European stance of women (Jamieson and European Commission 2005; Quintelier, Verhaegen, and Hooghe 2014). The data on intra-European movers gathered and analysed as part of the PIONEUR project showed the same tendency as Eurobarometer data, i.e. men identified more with Europe than women did (Braun and Müller 2012). We refrain from formulating any hypothesis regarding the direction of a possible effect, since the processes behind these different results are not entirely clear.

Because older people have generally been socialised in much more nationalised contexts and their experiences with globalisation are biographically more recent, identification with supra-national entities should be lower for them than for younger people, and this is what was found on the basis of Eurobarometer data (Citrin and Sides 2004). However, for intra-European migrants a weak effect could be found in the opposite direction, in the sense that the identification of older migrants with the European Union is higher than that of younger migrants (Braun and Müller 2012).

For migrants only, the *age at migration* should be relevant. Migration at younger ages should increase identification with the European Union, as the opening to new horizons took place in the formative years. A longer *duration of the stay* is expected to increase identification with the European Union, but possibly not above the level reached by the stayer population of the country of residence. These effects can be conceived as mainly mediated by opportunities in that a longer stay increases the exposure of migrants to new environments. Unfortunately, these theoretical propositions cannot be tested together given the database we use.

While Braun and Müller (2012) postulated identification differences depending on the *migration motives*, they did not find any. So we will also refrain from formulating a hypothesis in this regard.

With respect to the stayer population in European countries Fligstein (2009a) argued, based on Eurobarometer data, that *travels to other EU countries* would strengthen the identification with the European Union. However, having migrated is the major distinction of migrants from the national populations in the receiving countries. Nevertheless, both compared to the national populations and in comparison of the different migrant groups among each other, there are other aspects of physical mobility to take into account. Here it is useful to differentiate between experiences in other EU countries and non-EU countries. The latter should clearly be less relevant for European identification but could nevertheless have an effect by leading to a greater open-mindedness and cosmopolitan orientation in general.

Braun and Müller (2012) did not find any effect of a *previous sojourn in the country of residence* for intra-European migrants. However, the European Union is largely responsible for the opportunities migrants have to move freely between European countries. This benefit is particularly visible for migrants who have experienced multiple moves. Therefore, the aforementioned authors argued that a *previous sojourn in a third EU country* should strengthen identification with the European Union. This was actually what they found. Regarding current stayer populations available research which explicitly considers the effect of previous *prolonged* stays abroad on the identification towards Europe or other entities is mainly limited to student mobility (Fuss, García Albacete, and Rodríguez Monter 2004; Sigalas 2010; Kuhn 2012). Nevertheless we expect that sojourns in another EU country should strengthen European identification of national sample respondents, too. Sojourns in non-EU countries might show a weaker effect as they indeed could rather strengthen a more general cosmopolitanism instead.

Earlier studies found that *participation in exchange programmes* (e.g., Erasmus) do not have a significant impact on the identification of stayers with Europe. Kuhn (2012) argued that this is mainly due to the fact, that persons who are taking part in such programmes usually already have a very positive stance towards Europe to start with. Since nationals of all surveyed countries as well as Turkish citizens can participate in EU funded exchange programmes the influence of such experiences will also be tested. However, in accordance with the above mentioned argument we do not expect that the participation in Erasmus or other EU exchange programmes does significantly influence the identification of the migrants analysed here either.

Having a *partner from a third EU country* should be particularly beneficial for European identification, though Braun and Müller (2012) did not find a corresponding effect. However, their explanation for this is telling and warrants the inclusion of the variable here: In the bivariate case, they did find an effect of a *partner from a third country* on identification with the European Union, which vanished however upon inclusion of characteristics of the friendship network in the multivariate regression. This means that the effect of the ethnic origin of the partner is mediated by the friendship network. However, this does not exclude that the former might be still relevant in a different sample and, more generally, in the case of non-migrant respondents. Mau (2010) argues

that binational marriages and civil unions foster the transnationalisation of the individuals' daily lives as they potentially become part of social circles in more than one country. In this sense being in a relationship with a foreign EU citizen might also strengthen the identification with Europe as the legal framework created by the European Union facilitates the formation of such relations. Freedom of mobility and granting of social rights and benefits to EU citizens are only two aspects which might be mentioned in this regard. Furthermore, Europe might be conceived as a common cultural heritage and background by such couples. Having a partner from a third country could on the contrary be more conducive to a general cosmopolitan stance.

Friends originating from other EU countries and friends living in other EU countries should be most effective in strengthening European identification, for both movers and stayers. This is also what Braun and Müller (2012) have found in their study of intra-European migrants.

At least in theory, for migrants, transnational ties to the country of origin could prevent a complete reorientation towards the country of residence. If this holds, frequent *contacts with family members and friends in the country of origin* should have positive effects on country of origin identification and also on identification with the European Union, while they should not be conducive to country of residence identification. However and contrary to the expectations of Braun and Müller (2012), the impact of frequent contacts with family members and friends in the country of origin on identification with the European Union did not turn out to be significant. This is not too surprising, as the compatibility of simultaneous identifications with different geographical entities has been demonstrated in the literature.

Analysing data of the citizens of EU member states Gerhards (2012) has shown that there is a positive correlation between the *knowledge of languages* and the attachment to Europe. We would expect to see similar results, since language knowledge facilitates access to foreign country media and allows respondents furthermore to interact more closely with citizens of other EU countries. In the latter assumption we are following Fligstein (2009a) who considers direct contact with Europeans abroad a main driving force of European identification. With respect to migrants, Braun and Müller (2012) showed a similar effect of the proficiency in the CoR language.

The use of *foreign-language TV* should work in a similar way as the knowledge of additional languages. In addition, it is to be expected that it widens the horizon beyond the country of origin and the country of residence.

For migrants, Braun and Müller (2012) expected that experiences of discrimination in the country of residence should not only negatively affect identification with the country of residence but by means of generalization also the identification with the European Union. However, they could not find such an effect. Nevertheless, we postulate that with the Romanian and Turkish migrant samples we have here (which are both, though to different degrees, more outsiders to the EU than the migrant groups in the PIONEUR study), this might be different.

Data and Methods

The analyses presented in the following are based on the EUCROSS survey. Detailed information on the methodology of the survey, its implementation and on the characteristics of the different samples can be found in the methodological chapter of this report (Appendix A). For our analysis we use the quantitative data on all national, as well as Romanian and Turkish migrant samples in the six surveyed countries (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom).

The dependent variables

The chapter presents two related sets of regressions. The first ones (Tables 4-6) concentrate on identification with Europe. In general, identification with different geographic entities was measured by the question: "On a scale from one to five, where one means 'strongly disagree' and five means 'strongly agree', please tell me how much you agree with the following statements? (a) I feel as a citizen of the town where I live, b) I feel as a citizen of the region where I live, (c) I feel [CoR national], (d) *migrants only: I feel [CoO national]*, (e) I feel European, (f) I feel as a citizen of the world". All variables are reverse-coded. However, the orientation towards the remaining entities will only be used to put European identification into perspective and not in their own right. We treat European identification as a quantitative variable but have checked whether dichotomising the dependent variable leads to markedly different results, which was not the case.

The second set of regressions (Tables 7-8) uses the difference between identification with Europe and a more general cosmopolitan stance as independent variable. To this end a variable was created by subtracting the numeric value of the answer given to sub-item (f) above (I feel as a citizen of the world) from sub-item (e) (I feel European). This variable therefore could theoretically take values from -5 to 5, where positive values mean that the identification with Europe is higher than the identification as a citizen of the world.

The independent variables

Education is entered as three dummy variables for intermediary and upper secondary as well as university education (with those having a lower secondary education or less constituting the baseline).

The subjective economic situation at the age of 14 and at the time of the interview were measured by the questions: "Which of the following descriptions comes closest to your feelings about how well off the household you were living in was when you were 14 years old?" and "Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how well off your household is today?". The response categories were: "We are/were living very comfortably on the money we have/had", "we are/were living comfortably on the money we have/had", "we make/made ends meet", "we find/found it difficult" and "we find/found it very difficult".

Gender is a dummy variable with men as the baseline category, i.e. the effects presented pertain to women.

Age and, for migrants, duration of the stay in the CoR are included as quantitative variables. (As age at the time of migration is a linear combination of age and the duration of the stay in the country of residence, it is not possible to include all three variables at the same time in a regression.)

The migration motives of Romanian and Turkish respondents who are not living in their country of origin were measured by an open question. Three dummy variables are used for education, quality-of-life and family/love motives. The baseline is constituted by work motives.

Information on previous sojourns of three months or more in countries other than the country of origin and the country of residence were collected by the use of two items. The first one asked for stays realised before the age of 18 and the second one for those realised later in life. Since the respondents were asked to specify the country in which they stayed a differentiation following geographical criteria is possible. The answers to both mentioned items were combined and are entered as dummy variables for previous sojourn in another EU country and in any other country (i.e., which does not belong to the European Union). No previous stays of at least three months serves as the baseline.

The participation in exchange programmes is measured by the dichotomous item: "Have you ever (e.g. as student or during your professional career) participated in an international exchange program that has been funded or co-funded by the European Union?".

A number of variables are introduced for the measurement of recent mobility. Trips to other countries within the last 24 months that included at least one overnight stay are entered as two dummy variables for stays in another EU country and stays in any other country. For migrants these dummies do not include the respective CoO, as they are meant to measure the mobility between the CoR and third countries. As in the case of the above mentioned previous sojourns, these variables are dichotomous and indicate only whether or not the respondents visited the respective group of countries within the specified time frame. No stays in another country than the CoR or CoO serve as baseline. Furthermore, the total number of these trips and, for the migrant samples, the number of visits to the country of origin are included in the analysis by means of two separate quantitative variables, asking how many of these trips the respondents made in the last 24 months.

The origin of the partner is entered as dummy variables for partner from the country of residence, partner from another EU country and partner from a third non-EU country. Those who do not have a partner or whose partner is from the CoO (migrant samples only) serve as the baseline.

For the migrant samples we include measurements of integration into different social circles in the country of residence. Therefore, the existence of family members, in-laws and friends in the country of residence who come from the country of origin, the country of residence and a third country were measured by the items, "Please think about all family members, in-laws and friends you have who live in [CoR]. I would like to know: How many are originally from [CoO]? And how many are from [CoR]? And how many are

originally from other countries?” Answer categories were “none”, “a few” and “several”. These variables are treated as quantitative variables, although they were measured on an ordinal scale only.

The measurement of contacts abroad followed the same principles. Respective dummies are included in the regressions of nationals and migrants alike.

Besides the existence of a transnational network the data also allow an assessment of the frequency in which different forms of communication are used. To this end three items were included asking how often the respondents communicated during the last 12 months with friends and family abroad via phone or a software such as Skype, via mail or e-mail and via social networking sites (e.g., Facebook). The offered answer categories are “every day”, “at least once a week”, “at least once a month”, “less often” and “never”. These categories are reverse-coded.

Knowledge in a third language (other than the CoR and CoO language) is included as a dichotomous item with no additional language proficiencies as reference.

In order to allow for the measurement of foreign media consumption the following item was included: “The following question is about TV content (e.g. movies, sitcoms, news broadcasts, etc.) in other languages than [official CoR language] [and your native language]: How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and has not been dubbed, either directly on TV or via the Internet?”. The response categories were “every day”, “at least once a week”, “at least once a month”, “less often” and “never”. This question is reverse-coded.

For migrants only, discrimination experience was measured by the question “Have you ever felt discriminated against in [CoR] because you were born in another country?” Response categories were “no, never”, “yes, sometimes” and “yes, frequently”. This variable is treated as a quantitative variable, although it was measured on an ordinal scale only.

Analytical procedure

The results section begins with some preliminary analyses. First, descriptive information is provided on the distribution of the samples with regard to age, age at migration, duration of sojourn in the country of residence, gender and migration motives in the different subsamples. Obviously, some of these information apply to EUCROSS migrant samples only.

Second, the means for the identifications with the different geographical entities are presented.

This is, third, followed by a series of regressions of European identification on potential explanatory variables. In a first model, we include the different national populations or the migrant groups, respectively. Then we add core demographic variables, e.g., education, the perception of the own economic situation in childhood and at present, gender, and the variables measuring transnational behaviour, such as trips to other countries and friendship relationships.

Finally, similar regressions including country respectively migrant group dummies are presented using the difference between identification with Europe and self-description as citizen of the world as dependent variable.

Results

Descriptive information on the samples

Table 1 presents descriptive information on age, age at migration, duration of the sojourn and the gender composition of the different populations.

Table 1 Age, age at migration, duration of the sojourn and gender

	Age	Age at migration	Duration of sojourn in CoR	% female
Danes	49.1	--	--	50.0
Germans	49.9	--	--	51.2
Italians	50.1	--	--	57.6
Romanians	42.1	--	--	44.0
Spanish	48.7	--	--	52.7
British	56.0	--	--	52.9
<i>Turks in...</i>				
Denmark	41.2	20.8	20.4	47.2
Germany	46.2	19.1	27.1	56.1
Italy	33.9	24.9	9.0	43.8
Romania	40.7	29.0	11.7	31.2
United Kingdom	38.5	26.1	12.4	43.0
<i>Romanians in...</i>				
Denmark	33.4	26.3	7.1	41.0
Germany	48.8	33.4	15.5	56.8
Italy	42.2	29.3	12.9	59.8
Spain	36.8	28.5	8.2	58.7
United Kingdom	33.6	28.5	5.1	48.6

Source: EUCROSS (2013). Nationals: N=5951; Turks: N=1235; Romanians: N=1225

The mean age of national samples varies between 42 years in Romania and 56 in the United Kingdom. However, respondents in the four countries in between are much closer together as they show a mean age between approximately 49 and 50 years. The gender distribution amongst nationals is absolutely balanced in Denmark, where half of the sample is of either sex. All other samples, but the Romanian one, contain slightly more women than men. In Romania it is the other way around.

All migrant groups are on average younger than the respective national populations of their countries of residence. However, the difference is very small for both Turks and

Romanians in Germany. The average age of the migrants differs very much by both migrant group and country of residence.

Turks were typically younger than Romanians when they moved to their countries of residence, with the exception of the Turks in Romania which are in this respect more similar to the Romanian migrants than to the Turkish samples in other countries. With the only exception of Italy, Turks have spent already a considerably longer period in their countries of residence than Romanians.

The Turkish sample in Romania is also noticeable with respect to the gender distribution as it is composed of considerable more men than women. Otherwise the gender distribution amongst migrants is relatively balanced while, at the same time, displaying higher variance than amongst the national samples.

Table 2 presents information on the migration motives of the different migrant groups.

Table 2 Migration motives

	Work	Education	Quality of life	Family/love
<i>Turks in...</i>				
Denmark	27.2	0.8	6.0	69.6
Germany	20.6	2.8	2.8	72.6
Italy	45.6	25.2	7.2	25.2
Romania	67.6	4.4	4.4	21.2
United Kingdom	28.2	33.9	19.8	32.3
<i>Romanians in...</i>				
Denmark	49.6	25.6	17.6	14.0
Germany	32.0	2.8	14.8	53.6
Italy	63.2	1.6	10.0	32.0
Spain	70.8	1.2	11.2	21.6
United Kingdom	54.8	24.2	29.4	15.3

Source: EUCROSS (2013). Turks: N=1250; Romanians: N=1248

As far as the migration motives are concerned, very marked differences can be observed between the different groups. The Romanian samples in four of five surveyed countries show clear similarities as these participants migrated mainly for work reasons. Only for those Romanians who went to Germany family instead of work was the main reason to migrate.

The data of Turkish migrants gives a more diverse picture. On the one hand, Turkish migrants in Denmark and Germany, for instance, stated “family/love” as the main migration motive. Hence these are exactly those two samples who also show the lowest average age of migration and the longest duration of their stay. However, the fact that these respondents stated family reasons for their migration does not entirely come as a

surprise. For instance, in Germany three quarters of the interviewed Turkish nationals immigrated since the mid-1970s. This means that the majority of this sample arrived after the Federal Republic ceased its labour recruitment policy in 1973. Following this political decision, migration from Turkey did not end but its character changed, as many Turkish workers decided not to return to their country of origin for the time being. Instead family reunifications became a much more important migration pattern since those Turks already living in Germany started to invite their families to join them in a considerably higher number than before (Herbert 2003; Kastoryano 1996).

On the other hand, “work” was cited as main migration motive by Turkish respondents in Italy and Romania. Especially with respect to the latter a comparison to migration years and historical dates brings interesting insights. 72.4 per cent of our Turkish sample migrated to Romania between 1995 (the year in which Romania officially applied for EU membership) and 2007 (the year in which it joined the EU). Thus, this migration could, at least partially, have been motivated by the prospect of the future EU membership of this country. This is all the more plausible as in none of the other samples a majority migrated in this particular time period.

Table 3 Local, regional, country of origin, country of residence and European identification and cosmopolitan attitudes

	City	Region	CoO	CoR	Europe	World
Danes	4.4	4.4	--	4.8	3.9	3.4
Germans	4.0	3.9	--	4.3	4.0	3.4
Italians	3.9	3.8	--	4.3	3.9	3.9
Romanians	4.2	4.2	--	4.6	3.8	4.0
Spanish	4.2	4.1	--	4.2	4.1	4.3
British	3.9	3.9	--	4.4	3.0	3.4
<i>Turks in...</i>						
Denmark	3.4	3.3	4.5	1.7	2.7	4.1
Germany	3.4	3.3	4.7	1.3	2.9	3.8
Italy	3.1	3.0	4.4	2.0	3.0	4.0
Romania	4.8	4.7	4.8	1.0	4.7	4.9
United Kingdom	3.4	3.2	4.3	2.8	3.0	4.1
<i>Romanians in...</i>						
Denmark	3.4	3.5	4.3	2.2	4.5	4.5
Germany	3.7	3.7	4.3	2.9	4.3	4.3
Italy	3.8	3.7	4.5	2.4	4.5	4.3
Spain	3.7	3.7	4.7	2.2	4.4	4.4
United Kingdom	3.4	3.3	4.3	2.4	4.1	4.0

Source: EUCROSS (2013). Nationals: N=5856; Turks: N=1209; Romanians: N=1200

Identification with different geographical entities

Table 3 presents the group averages for local, regional, country of origin, country of residence and European identification as well as more general cosmopolitan attitudes.

Danes show clearly the strongest identifications with both their city and their region. On the bottom, we find the Italians and the British. With the exception of Romanians in Italy and Turks in Romania, the migrant populations show lower local and regional identifications than the corresponding national populations. Romanians score slightly higher than the Turks in some countries, only.

With regard to country of origin identification the migrant groups do not differ very much from each other and from the national populations' orientation towards the countries they live in.

Identification with the country of residence is again highest for the Danes, followed by the Romanians. With the exception of Spain, it is higher than local and regional identifications. Unsurprisingly, identification with the country of residence is much lower for the migrants than for the national populations. Romanian migrants identify more with their country of residence than Turkish migrants do, with the only exception of the United Kingdom where it is the other way around.

An interesting picture emerges for identification with the EU: With the exception of the United Kingdom, where identification with the EU is rather weak, all other stayer populations are on a comparable level. However, European identification among stayers is in most cases markedly below that of country of residence identification, in particular in Denmark and Romania. Romanian migrants score higher than the stayer populations and dramatically higher than the Turks, with the only exception of Turkish EUCROSS respondents in Romania who identify more with Europe than any other group. It is also noteworthy that identification with the EU is, by a wide margin, higher than identification with the country of residence for all migrant groups.

A general cosmopolitan attitude is slightly higher than EU identification in Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom, while the contrary is true in Italy, Romania and Spain. The difference between the Romanian and Turkish migrants is rather small and most pronounced in Germany. Especially high cosmopolitanism is found among the Turks in Romania. The members of this group are indeed exceptional in their high local and regional as well as supra-national identifications, combined with a complete lack of identification with Romania as a country. When comparing European identification and cosmopolitanism among migrants, it becomes obvious that for the Turks cosmopolitanism is much higher than identification with Europe, while for the Romanians there is virtually no difference between the two.

Multivariate analysis of European identification

Table 4 shows two regression models for EU identification for the national populations. Model 1 includes only the country dummies (Denmark is used as a baseline) and model 2 adds the demographic and behavioural variables.

Table 4: Regression models for European identification for the national samples (unstandardised regression coefficients)

	Model 1	Model 2
Germans (<i>baseline: Danes</i>)	0.069	0.165**
Italians	0.009	0.201**
Romanians	-0.145**	0.082
Spaniards	0.213***	0.387***
British	-0.982***	-0.911***
Education (<i>baseline: lower secondary education or less</i>)		
Intermediary secondary		0.012
Higher secondary		0.015
University		0.030
Economic household situation (age 14)		-0.010
Economic household situation (currently)		0.095***
Female		0.116***
Age		0.008***
Physical mobility		
Previous sojourn in an EU country		-0.024
Previous sojourn in a non-EU country		0.102
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies		0.072
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies		-0.083
Number of recent trips abroad		0.027
Participation in an EU exchange programme		0.118
Partner (<i>baseline: no partner or partner from CoR</i>)		
Partner from another EU country		0.178
Partner from non-EU country		-0.102
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoR		-0.018
from third country		0.058
Frequency of communication abroad via		
Telephone or computer (Skype etc.)		0.031
Mail or e-mail		0.033
Social networking sites		-0.022
Knowledge of foreign language/s		0.157**
Consumption of TV content in a foreign language		0.037**
Constant	3.936***	2.664***
N	5,979	5,698
Adj. R ²	0.090	0.116

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Without any controls for transnational behaviour and the demographic variables (Model 1), the Danes, Germans, and Italians are on the same level of European identification. The Spaniards are on a slightly higher and the Romanians on a slightly lower level than the former, while the British identify markedly less with Europe. This picture changes to some extent but not dramatically, once the controls are introduced: Germans and Italians show now slightly more European identification than the Danes, the Romanians are on the same level, and the Spaniards identify clearly more with Europe than the Danes. The British remain the group which identifies least with Europe.

Only a few of the demographic variables and forms of transnational behaviour have a significant effect: The better the current economic situation of the household, the more European respondents feel. Women identify more with Europe than men. The same holds true for older compared to younger people, contrary to our expectation regarding the stayer population and to earlier Eurobarometer based analysis. The knowledge of foreign languages and the consumption of TV content in a foreign language also contribute to European identification amongst the nationals.

While the country dummies alone explain 9 per cent of the variance in European identification, together with the demographic variables and transnational behaviour, nearly 12 per cent can be explained. Further analysis (tables not presented) show for the entire sample of nationals, i.e. for all countries taken together, the demographic variables and transnational behaviour alone explain some 2 per cent of the variance but the differences between the single countries are considerable. While in the United Kingdom nearly 10 per cent and in Italy nearly 8 per cent of the variance of European identification can be explained by the variables considered, it is only 4 per cent in Germany and between 1.3 and 2.4 per cent in Romania, Spain and Denmark.

Similar results as for European identification can be obtained for cosmopolitanism, as far as the effects of the current economic situation of the household, gender, and age are concerned. However, with regard to transnational behaviour, entirely different variables are relevant: Longer sojourns outside of the European Union, number of trips abroad in the last 24 months, having a non-EU partner, and contacts to foreign countries (Table not presented). We can conclude that identification with the EU is not just a variant of a general cosmopolitan attitude but determined by different variables, at least in part. We will therefore analyse which variables have an influence on whether respondents identify more with Europe than with the entire world. But before embarking on that, we will turn to the European identification of the Romanian and Turkish migrants.

Table 5 shows the two regression models for EU identification for the migrants. Model 1 includes only the dummies for the migrant groups (the Turks in Denmark are used as a baseline) and model 2 adds the demographic and behavioural variables. While these models resemble those in Table 4, it should be noted that, for migrants, additional variables are included.

Table 5 Regression models for European identification for the migrant groups (unstandardised regression coefficients)

	Model 1	Model 2
Turks in Germany (<i>baseline: Turks in Denmark</i>)	0.249*	0.415***
Turks in Italy	0.344**	0.237
Turks in Romania	2.007***	1.932***
Turks in United Kingdom	0.303**	0.275*
Romanians in Denmark	1.802***	1.634***
Romanians in Germany	1.709***	1.466***
Romanians in Italy	1.834***	1.660***
Romanians in Spain	1.730***	1.686***
Romanians in United Kingdom	1.449***	1.382***
<i>Education (baseline: lower secondary education or less)</i>		
Intermediary secondary		0.084
Higher secondary		0.119
University		0.135
Economic household situation (age 14)		-0.062*
Economic household situation (currently)		0.060
Female		0.107
Age		0.007*
Duration of stay in CoR		-0.000
<i>Migration motives (baseline: work)</i>		
Education		0.096
Quality of life		0.051
Family/love		0.020
<i>Physical mobility</i>		
Previous sojourn in a EU country		0.020
Previous sojourn in a non-EU country		-0.215
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies		-0.027
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies		0.047
Number of recent trips abroad (except CoO)		0.039
Number of recent trips to CoO		0.031
Participation in a EU exchange programme		0.087
<i>Partner(baseline: no partner or partner from CoO)</i>		
from CoR		-0.089
from another EU country		0.184
from non-EU country		0.132
<i>Social contacts in CoR - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally</i>		
from CoO		-0.041
from CoR		0.167***
from third countries		-0.034

	Model 1	Model 2
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO and living there		0.002
from CoO living neither there nor in CoR		-0.060
from third country living in any country but CoR		0.044
Frequency of communication abroad via		
Telephone or computer (Skype etc.)		-0.041
Mail or e-mail		0.011
Social networking sites		0.054*
Knowledge of additional language/s		0.283***
Consumption of TV content in a third language		0.025
Discrimination experience		-0.118**
Constant	2.656***	1.965***
N	2,474	2,227
Adj. R ²	0.274	0.301

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

In the case of the migrant samples, group dummies explain 27.4 per cent of the variance in European identification. The Romanians in all countries of residence resemble each other and are located on a much higher level of European identification than the Turks. The latter are also very similar in all the countries of residence, with the notable exception of the Turks in Romania who are on the same level as the Romanian migrants. Adding the demographic and behavioural variables increases explained variance to 30.0 per cent. However, all the migrant-group dummies (with the exception of Turkish migrants in Italy) remain significant. In fact, 14.7 per cent of the variance is due to the migrant groups as such, not mediated through the demographic and behavioural variables. As the Turks in Romania also contribute to the differences on the migrant-group level, we also performed analyses using just a more general migrant-group dummy, distinguishing Turkish from Romanian migrants. Virtually the same results come out of this analysis (7.6 per cent of the variance is explained by the distinction between Turks and Romanians as such). That is, Turkish and Romanian migrants differ from each other over and above what can be expected by their different demographic background and their transnational behaviour. This result is in support of our assumption that the different formal legal status of Romanian and Turkish migrants strongly influences their differences in European identification.

As far as the transnational background and behaviour variables are concerned, very few of them have a significant effect. As hypothesised, those migrants who stated that they spent their youth in economically difficult conditions show more European identification than those who did not. However, since this was measured by a retrospective assessment which probably most respondents gave in direct comparison to their current situation, it basically means that the identification with Europe is higher for those respondents who subjectively judge that they achieved a substantial improvement of their economic

situation since their late childhood. It seems safe to assume that they attribute this improvement to a large extent to the realisation of their migratory project and the opportunities it provided them with. This could also indicate that the differences in attitudes towards the European Union are connected to a growing gap between winners and losers of globalisation which is attested by Kriesi et al. (2006). Recent findings based on Eurobarometer data confirmed that such an effect is indeed visible regarding the EU-population as a whole (Teney, Lacewell, and De Wilde 2014). However, a thorough test of this hypothesis would have gone beyond the scope of this article and is not possible with the present data. Therefore, it has to be reserved for future research.

Older migrants are also more attached to Europe than the younger ones. Trips to other countries within the last two years do not have a significant impact on the orientation towards Europe. However, the lack of such an effect has to be evaluated keeping in mind that all analysed samples have the major mobility experience, namely the migration to another country, in common. Therefore, short-term mobility has a smaller impact on individual self-conception than for non-migrants. Among the variables characterising the friendship network, only the number of friends from the country of residence who live in the country of residence have a significant positive effect. The same applies to the frequency of contacts via social networking sites with family members, relatives and friends abroad during the last year. However, neither the existence of broader transnational networks (within the EU or beyond), nor regular contact to friends and family abroad via telephone, mail or e-mail have significant effects in this direction. As expected, additional languages have a positive effect. Finally, experiences of discrimination have a negative effect on European identification.

As we did above with regard to nationals, for the migrant groups a short assessment should be given, on what changes when taking cosmopolitanism as the dependent variable instead of European identification (table not presented). In addition to higher secondary education, the current economic situation of the household has a positive effect (but there is no effect of the economic situation at age 14). Moreover, the frequency of communication abroad via social networking sites has a positive effect (but not communication by telephone or Skype). Finally, knowledge of additional languages has a positive effect, as it had for European identification.

Also for the migrants, we can thus conclude that identification with the EU is not just a variant of a general cosmopolitan attitude but determined by mostly different variables.

Table 6 Separate regression models for European identification of Turkish and Romanian migrants (unstandardised regression coefficients)

	Romanian migrants	Turkish migrants
Education (<i>baseline: lower secondary education or less</i>)		
Intermediary secondary	0.099	0.115
Higher secondary	0.175	-0.018
University	0.103	0.004
Economic household situation (age 14)	0.003	-0.171***
Economic household situation (currently)	-0.007	0.164**
Female	0.004	0.254**
Age	0.007	0.014*
Duration of stay in CoR	-0.009	-0.006
Migration motives (<i>baseline: work</i>)		
Education	-0.061	-0.060
Quality of life	-0.077	0.017
Family/ love	-0.041	-0.211*
Physical mobility		
Previous sojourn in a EU country	0.144	-0.102
Previous sojourn in a non-EU country	-0.332*	-0.174
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies	0.102	-0.411**
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies	0.049	0.242
Number of recent trips abroad (except CoO)	0.008	0.072
Number of recent trips to CoO	-0.004	0.094*
Participation in a EU exchange programme	0.111	0.078
Partner (<i>baseline: no partner or partner from CoO</i>)		
from CoR	0.058	-0.084
from another EU country	-0.147	0.364
from non-EU country	-0.030	0.151
Social contacts in CoR - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO	-0.005	-0.009
from CoR	0.130**	0.286***
from third countries	-0.046	-0.183*
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO and living there	-0.081	0.431***
from CoO living neither there nor in CoR	-0.030	-0.315***
from third country living in any country but CoR	0.027	-0.046
Frequency of communication abroad via		
Telephone or computer (Skype etc.)	-0.016	-0.201***
Mail or e-mail	-0.000	0.042
Social networking sites	0.042	0.082*
Knowledge of additional language/s	0.181	0.449***
Consumption of TV content in a third language	-0.006	0.131***

	Romanian migrants	Turkish migrants
Discrimination experience	-0.162***	-0.148*
Constant	4.096***	1.804***
N	1,110	1,117
Adj. R ²	0.020	0.167

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

When looking separately at the regressions for Romanian and Turkish migrants (Table 6), a striking result appears: Romanian attitudes are only to a very small degree accounted by demographical and behavioural variables; only 2 per cent of the variance can be explained. That means that Romanian migrants show high identification with Europe, largely independent of their transnational background and their transnational behaviour. For Turks this is the opposite: With nearly 17 per cent of explained variance, the independent variables taken together have an impact more than eight times as big.

In the Romanian samples, having lived in a country outside of the European Union for more than three months has a small negative effect. Social integration in the country of residence, measured here by the number of family members, relatives and friends who are natives, has a strong positive impact on European identification. Interestingly, it seems that for this effect to occur, a higher number of close contacts with people whom the respondents do not consider migrants but of CoR origin is needed, on the contrary having a CoR partner alone does not have a significant effect. Finally, discrimination experiences have a negative effect.

For Turks, however, a much longer list of variables is relevant: Unfavourable economic conditions in the youth of the migrant and favourable conditions at present increase European identification. Women and older migrants have a stronger attachment. Especially the former is noteworthy as it means that, not only contrary to Eurobarometer results on stayer populations but also in contrast to the findings regarding movers from EU-15 countries, in the case of Turkish migrants it is actually women who are more likely to identify with Europe. Moreover, as for the latter, our results are contrary to Eurobarometer results on stayer populations but in line with the results regarding movers from EU-15 countries. A higher number of trips to the country of origin in the last 24 months has a positive impact. The same holds true for family members, relatives and friends who are originally from Turkey and also live there. In the light of the above discussed influence of the assessment of the migration project as an economic success this could indicate that returning to the country of origin and encountering family members there causes respondents to judge their current situation favourable and to attribute positive developments and aspects, at least partially, to opportunities provided by the European Union. Family members, relatives and friends from the country of residence who live in the country of residence have a positive but those from other countries (presumably largely non-Europeans) have a negative impact. The same applies to family reasons as migration motive. This points to a similar positive impact of social

integration as in the case of Romanian migrants. The frequency of contacts on the telephone with family members, relatives and friends abroad during the last year decreases European identification, but when these contacts are via social networks they have a positive impact. This might mean that it is less the contact with these people as such which has an effect but the medium used. Unsurprisingly, additional language knowledge has a positive effect on European identification as has the consumption of foreign-language TV. Finally, discrimination experiences have a negative effect.

Summarising the results on European identification, we can conclude that the demographic and behavioural variables work in a markedly different way in the different populations under investigation. They play a considerable role in explaining European identification of the Turkish migrants and the British and Italian nationals but are virtually unimportant for the Romanian migrants as well as for the Romanian and Spanish nationals.

Multivariate analysis of the difference between European identification and cosmopolitanism

In the following we will use the difference between European identification and cosmopolitanism as the dependent variable. Higher values mean that the identification with Europe is stronger than the identification as citizen of the world.

When controlling for the demographic and behavioural variables, compared to Danes and Germans, for all the other populations the balance between cosmopolitanism and European identification is more in favour of the former. Besides the country dummies, age is highly significant (in a positive direction). This means the higher the age of the respondent, the more European identification is boosted versus a general cosmopolitanism.

The fact that both partner origin variables are very significant, too, underlines the importance of such cross-cultural contacts on a very private and close level. The effects are in the expected direction: having a partner from another EU country is positively related to a more European identification whereas respondents whose partner comes from a third country tend to be more inclined towards a more universal cosmopolitan stance. Interestingly social contacts to people abroad show only significance when they consist of co-nationals and in this case they are favouring rather a cosmopolitan than a European identification. However, this might well be related to the question whether these contacts themselves live within the confines of the European Union or not, which is a fact that was not controlled for in this model. Other aspects related to a comparatively stronger identification with Europe are frequent communication abroad by telephone and foreign language knowledge. Finally, recent trips abroad show only significance when they were directed to non-EU countries and are unsurprisingly positively related to a more cosmopolitan than European stance. Country dummies, demographic and behavioural variables account for 9 per cent of the variance.

Table 7 Regression model for the difference between European identification and cosmopolitanism for the national samples (unstandardised regression coefficients)

	Nationals
Germans (<i>baseline: Danes</i>)	0.040
Italians	-0.488***
Romanians	-0.748***
Spaniards	-0.708***
British	-1.025***
Education (<i>baseline: lower secondary education or less</i>)	
Intermediary secondary	-0.069
Higher secondary	0.003
University	0.011
Economic household situation (age 14)	0.002
Economic household situation (currently)	0.046*
Female	-0.008
Age	0.005***
Physical mobility	
Previous sojourn in a EU country	-0.005
Previous sojourn in a non-EU country	-0.066
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies	0.088
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies	-0.118*
Number of recent trips abroad	-0.026
Participation in a EU exchange programme	0.043
Partner(<i>baseline: no partner or partner from CoR</i>)	
Partner from another EU country	0.380**
Partner from non-EU country	-0.310**
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally	
Social contacts abroad - from CoR	-0.103**
from third country	-0.038
Frequency of communication abroad via	
Telephone or computer (Skype etc.)	0.056*
Mail or e-mail	0.014
Social networking sites	-0.034
Knowledge of foreign language/s	0.129*
Consumption of TV content in a foreign language	0.010
Constant	0.082
N	5,629
Adj. R ²	0.093

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

If we leave the country dummies aside, the demographic and behavioural variables alone explain 3.3 per cent of the variance for all countries taken together. However, individual samples differ considerably: While for Germany, nearly 5 per cent and in Italy nearly 4 per

cent of the variance can be explained, these variables explain virtually nothing in Denmark and Romania. Spain and the United Kingdom are in-between (Tables not presented).

The following table presents the corresponding results for the Romanian and Turkish migrants. Please consider that additional variables are included again for the migrants.

Table 8 Regression models for the difference between European identification and cosmopolitanism for the migrant groups (unstandardised regression coefficients)

	Romanian migrants	Turkish migrants
Country of residence		
<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Romanians in Denmark</i>	<i>Turks in Denmark</i>
Germany	0.039	0.507**
Italy	0.245	0.294
Romania	---	1.136***
Spain	0.121	---
United Kingdom	0.167	0.252
Education (<i>baseline: lower secondary education or less</i>)		
Intermediary secondary	-0.309	-0.035
Higher secondary	-0.224	-0.144
University	-0.109	0.080
Economic household situation (age 14)	-0.013	-0.080
Economic household situation (currently)	-0.070	0.004
Female	-0.050	0.329**
Age	0.008	0.005
Duration of stay in CoR	-0.011	0.016*
Migration motives (<i>baseline: work</i>)		
Education	0.228	0.138
Quality of life	-0.013	-0.302
Family/love	0.049	-0.171
Physical mobility		
Previous sojourn in a EU country	0.032	-0.109
Previous sojourn in an non-EU country	-0.231	-0.102
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies	-0.025	-0.249
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies	-0.034	-0.155
Number of recent trips abroad (except CoO)	0.032	0.143*
Number of recent trips to CoO	-0.008	0.050
Participation in a EU exchange programme	0.131	0.125

	Romanian migrants	Turkish migrants
Partner (<i>baseline: no partner or partner from CoO</i>)		
from CoR	0.066	-0.038
from another EU country	-0.419	0.094
from non-EU country	0.025	0.788
Social contacts in CoR - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO	-0.001	-0.076
from CoR	0.104	0.119
from third countries	0.049	-0.157
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO and living there	-0.030	0.006
from CoO living neither there nor in CoR	-0.095	-0.066
from third country living in any country but CoR	-0.058	0.173
Frequency of communication abroad via		
Telephone or computer (Skype etc.)	0.001	-0.016
Mail or e-mail	-0.043	-0.027
Social networking sites	-0.027	0.084*
Knowledge of additional language/s	-0.096	0.169
Consumption of TV content in a third language	-0.010	0.046
Discrimination experience	-0.129*	-0.107
Constant	0.525	-2.011***
N	1,098	1,112
Adj. R ²	0.014	0.091

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

For Romanian migrants, even if the dummies for the respective countries of residence are included, only slightly more than 1 per cent of the variance can be explained. The only significant effect is discrimination experience. The more discrimination is felt, the weaker European identification becomes relative to a general cosmopolitanism.

For the Turks, this is different. All variables together explain 9 per cent of the variance. Our model shows that female Turkish migrants incline towards European identification rather than cosmopolitanism. Likewise, the length of the stay in the CoR, the number of recent trips abroad and the frequency of using social networking sites all strengthen EU versus cosmopolitan orientation. In contrast to the Romanians, discrimination experience has no effect for the Turkish migrants.

If we use the demographic and behavioural variables alone, the explained variance for all Romanian migrant groups taken together is 1.3 per cent. We find again differences between the respective countries of residence: With more than 4 per cent most is

explained for the Romanian migrants in Germany and the United Kingdom but virtually nothing in Denmark (Tables not presented).

For all Turkish migrant groups taken together, if we again use demographic and behavioural variables alone, the explained variance is 6.7 per cent. Differences between the single countries of residence are even more pronounced for the Turks than for the Romanian migrants. While 10 per cent of the variance for the Turks in Romania, 8 per cent for the Turks in Italy and 2 per cent for the Turks in Denmark is accounted for, virtually nothing can be explained in Germany and the United Kingdom (Tables not presented).

Conclusions

Of the EUCROSS respondents in the national samples the British identify least with Europe and the Spanish most. All the other national groups are closer to the Spanish than to the British, while the differences among them are not very pronounced. Variables that explain European identification of the national populations are gender, age, the current economic situation of the household, the knowledge of foreign languages and the consumption of TV content in a foreign language. However, the demographic variables and transnational behaviour explain overall only 2 per cent of the variance and the differences between the single countries are considerable (from nearly 10 per cent in the United Kingdom to slightly more than 1 per cent in Romania).

Romanian migrants show a much higher European identification than Turkish migrants, even under control of the demographic and behavioural variables. This dissimilarity can largely be explained by their different legal status, as it remains even after control for demographical and behavioural variables. It is interesting that the latter variables explain very little in the Romanian case, while for the Turks transnational background and behaviour go a long way in explaining their European identification. Variables found to be relevant include language knowledge, media consumption, personal networks and communication with people in other countries.

Demographic and behavioural variables work in a markedly different way in the different populations under investigation. They play a considerable role in explaining European identification of the Turkish migrants and the British and Italian nationals but are virtually unimportant for the Romanian migrants as well as for the Romanian and Spanish nationals. While the level of European identification of the Romanian migrants is so high that there is only little room for the working of transnational background, behaviour and experiences, this explanation hardly can be applied to the other populations. It is also noteworthy that there is no principal divide between nationals on the one hand and migrants on the other in the explanatory power of transnational background, behaviour and experiences. It could have been expected that these variables have a stronger effect for nationals than for migrants, as for the latter they might be less relevant compared to their migration experience as such.

We also analysed the balance between European identification and cosmopolitanism, that is, whether respondents identify more with Europe than with the entire world. When controlling for the demographical and behavioural variables, compared to Danes and

Germans, for all the other populations the balance between cosmopolitanism and European identification is, at times markedly, more in favour of the former. European identification is boosted versus a general cosmopolitanism by a better current economic situation of the household, a higher age of the respondent, having a partner from another EU country, having frequent communication abroad by telephone and knowing foreign languages. On the other hand, cosmopolitanism becomes stronger than European identification if the respondent has recently made trips to non-EU countries, has a partner from a non-EU country and has CoR contacts abroad. While the demographic and behavioural variables explain some 3 per cent of the variance for all countries taken together, individual samples again differ considerably (from nearly 5 per cent in Germany to virtually nothing in Denmark and Romania).

For Romanian migrants only slightly more than 1 per cent of the variance can be explained, the only significant effect being discrimination experience. For the Turkish migrants, nearly 7 per cent of the variance is accounted for, with marked differences between the single countries of residence. Women tend more to European identification than to cosmopolitanism, and the length of stay in the CoR, the number of recent trips abroad and the frequency of using social networking sites strengthen EU versus cosmopolitan orientation.

Overall, European identification is not just a variant of a general supra-national attitude but is determined by different variables, at least in part.

References

- Braun, Michael and Camelia Arsene. 2009. "The Demographics of Movers and Stayers in the European Union." In *Pioneers of European Integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*, edited by Ettore Recchi and Adrian Favell. Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Braun, Michael and Angelika Glöckner-Rist. 2012. "Patterns of Social Integration of Western European Migrants." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 13: 403-422.
- Braun, Michael and Walter Müller. 2012. "National and Transnational Identities of Intra-European Migrants." In *Crossing Borders, Shifting Boundaries. National and Transnational Identities in Europe and Beyond*, edited by Franz Höllinger and Markus Hadler. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.
- Brubaker, Rogers, ed. 1989. *Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham/Washington, D.C.: University Press of America/German Marshall Fund of the United States.
- Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond "identity"." *Theory and Society* 29 (1): 1-47.
- Bruter, Michael. 2005. *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Citrin, Jack and John Sides. 2004. "More than Nationals: How Identity Choice Matters in the New Europe." In *Transnational Identities. Becoming European in the EU*, edited by

- Richard K. Herrmann, Thomas Risse and Marilyn B. Brewer. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Deutsch, Karl W., Sidney A. Burrell, Robert A. Kann, Maurice jr Lee, Martin Lichtermann, Raymond E. Lindgren, Francis L. Loewenheim, and Richard W. van Wageningen. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. A Publication of the Center for Research on World Political Institutions, Princeton University. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Díez Medrano, Juan and Paula Gutiérrez. 2001. "Nested Identities. National and European Identity in Spain." *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (5): 753-778.
- Dubé, Sébastien and Raul Magni-Berton. 2009. "How does Income Influence National and European Identity?" In *Euroscepticism Images of Europe among Mass Publics and Political Elites*, edited by Dieter Fuchs, Raul Magni-Berton and Antoine Rogers, 73-90. Opladen: Budrich.
- Duchesne, Sophie and André-Paul Frogner. 2008. "National and European Identifications: A Dual Relationship." *Comparative European Politics* 6 (2): 143-168.
- . 2002. "Sur les dynamiques sociologiques et politiques de l'identification de l'Europe." *Revue Française de Science Politique* 52 (4): 355-373.
- Ecirli, Ahmet, Iulian Stănescu, and Mihai Dumitru. 2011. *The Turkish Community in Bucharest: A Sociological Overview*. <http://www.inovatie-sociala.ro/index.php/jurnal/article/view/129> (accessed 2013/01/14).
- Esser, Hartmut. 1980. *Aspekte der Wanderungssoziologie: Assimilation und Integration von Wanderern, ethnischen Gruppen und Minderheiten: Eine handlungstheoretische Analyse*. Soziologische Texte. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
- European Commission. 2011. *Report from the Commission to the Council on the Functioning of the Transitional Arrangements on Free Movement of Workers from Bulgaria and Romania* COM(2011) 729. <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7204&langId=en> (accessed 2013/10/24).
- Favell, Adrian. 2008. *Eurostars and Eurocities: Free Movement and Mobility in an Integrating Europe*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Fligstein, Neil. 2009a. *Euroclash. The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Reprint ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- . 2009b. "Who are the Europeans and how does this Matter for Politics?" In *European Identity*, edited by Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuchs, Dieter. 2011. "European Identity and Support for European Integration." In *Debating Political Identity and Legitimacy in the European Union*, edited by Sonia Lucarelli, Furio Cerutti and Vivien A. Schmidt. London: Routledge.
- Fuss, Daniel, Gema M. García Albacete, and Miryam Rodríguez Monter. 2004. "The Role of Language Skills and Foreign Country Experiences in the Development of European Identity." *Sociología* 36 (3): 273-285.
- Gerhards, Jürgen. 2012. *From Babel to Brussels: European Integration and the Importance of Transnational Linguistic Capital*. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.

- Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Christina Szanton Blanc. 1995. "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration." *Anthropological Quarterly* 68 (1): 48-63.
- Guarnizo, Luis E. 1998. "The Rise of Transnational Social Formations: Mexican and Dominican State Responses to Transnational Migration." *Political Power and Social Theory* 12: 45-94.
- Heckmann, Friedrich and Dominique Schnapper. 2003. "Introduction." In *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies*, edited by Friedrich Heckmann and Dominique Schnapper. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Herbert, Ulrich. 2003. *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland: Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge*. Bonn: C. H. Beck.
- Itzigsohn, José, Carlos Dore Cabral, Esther Hernandez Medina, and Obed Vazquez. 1999. "Mapping Dominican Transnationalism: Narrow and Broad Transnational Practices." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 316-339.
- Jamieson, Lynn and European Commission (eds.). 2005. *Orientations of Young Men and Women to Citizenship and European Identity*. Youth and European Identity Final Report. http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/youth-and-european-identity-final-report_en.pdf (accessed 2014/04/16).
- Kastoryano, Riva. 1996. *La France, l'Allemagne et leurs immigrants: Négocier l'identité*. Paris: Colin.
- King, Russell. 2002. "Towards a New Map of European Migration." *International Journal of Population Geography* 8 (2): 89-106.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschie, and Timotheos Frey. 2006. "Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared." *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (6): 921-956.
- Kuhn, Theresa. 2011. "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory." *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (6): 811-837.
- . 2012. "Why Educational Exchange Programmes Miss their Mark: Cross-Border Mobility, Education and European Identity." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 50 (6): 994-1010.
- Light, Duncan and Craig Young. 2009. "European Union Enlargement, Post-Accession Migration and Imaginative Geographies of the 'New Europe': Media Discourses in Romania and the United Kingdom." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 26 (3): 281-303.
- Mau, Steffen. 2010. *Social Transnationalism: Lifeworlds Beyond the Nation-State*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mau, Steffen, Jan Mewes, and Ann Zimmermann. 2008. "Cosmopolitan Attitudes through Transnational Social Practices?" *Global Networks* 8 (1): 1-24.
- McLaren, Lauren M. 2001. "Immigration and the New Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion in the European Union: The Effect of Elites and the EU on Individual-Level Opinions regarding European and Non-European Immigrants." *European Journal of Political Research* 39 (1): 81-108.

- Moroşanu, Laura and Jon E. Fox. 2013. "'No Smoke without Fire': Strategies of Coping with Stigmatised Migrant Identities." *Ethnicities* 13 (4): 438-456.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1999. "Conclusion: Towards a New World: The Origins and Effects of Transnational Activities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 463-477.
- Pries, Ludger. 2008. *Die Transnationalisierung der Sozialen Welt: Sozialräume jenseits von Nationalgesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Quintelier, Ellen, Soetkin Verhaegen, and Marc Hooghe. 2014. "The Intergenerational Transmission of European Identity: The Role of Gender and Discussion within Families." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*: 1-17.
- Recchi, Ettore. 2008. "Cross-State Mobility in the EU." *European Societies* 10 (2): 197-224.
- Recchi, Ettore and Adrian Favell. 2009. *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*. Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Risse, Thomas. 2010. "Multiple Europes: The Europeanization of Citizens' Identities." In *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*, edited by Thomas Risse. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Scheuer, Angelika and Hermann Schmitt. 2007. "Dynamics in European Political Identity." In *European Elections after Eastern Enlargement. Preliminary Results from the European Election Study 2004*, edited by Michael Marsh, Slava Mikhaylov and Hermann Schmitt. Mannheim: CONNEX.
- Schmidt, Siegmund, Jens Tenscher, and Andrea Weber. 2003. "Mit Herz und Verstand? Zur Akzeptanz des europäischen Integrationsprozesses in der Südpfalz." In *Europäische Integration in der öffentlichen Meinung*, edited by Frank Brettschneider, Jan van Deth and Edeltraud Roller. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Sigalas, Emmanuel. 2010. "Cross-Border Mobility and European Identity: The Effectiveness of Intergroup Contact during the ERASMUS Year Abroad." *European Union Politics* 11 (2): 241-265.
- Smith, Robert C. 1998. "Transnational Localities. Community, Technology and the Politics of Membership within the Context of Mexico and U.S. Migration." In *Transnationalism from Below*, edited by Michael Peter Smith and Luis E. Guarnizo. New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers.
- Teney, Céline, Onawa Promise Lacewell, and Pieter De Wilde. 2014. "Winners and Losers of Globalization in Europe: Attitudes and Ideologies." *European Political Science Review* FirstView: 1-21.
- Uccellini, Cara. 2012. "Romanian Migration to Italy: Insiders and Outsiders." In *Globalisation, Migration, and the Future of Europe. Insiders and Outsiders*, edited by Leila Simona Talani. New York: Routledge.